

REMARKS

Applicants' attorney thanks the Examiner for her comments. The Examiner allowed Claims 16-19, and rejected all remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, based on failure to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner found that the specification does not disclose voids extending in a cross-machine direction as recited in previous independent Claims 1 and 20. No claim was rejected based on prior art. Applicants have canceled all of the rejected claims.

New Claims 30-52 depend from allowed Claim 16, and are patentable for at least the same reasons. New Claims 30-52 correspond to dependent claims previously in this application, which were subject to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 based on language in independent Claims 1 and 20. The dependent claims were subject only to the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 1 and 20, and were not independently rejected for any reason. Therefore, Applicants' rewriting of these claims to depend from allowed Claim 16 should not burden the Examiner in this after-final stage of prosecution.

For the convenience of the Examiner, the following table shows the correspondence between the canceled dependent claims and the new Claims 30-52. No additional features are being claimed.

New Claim	Corresponding Canceled Claim
30	2
31	3
32	4
33	5
34	6
35	7
36	8
37	9
38	10

Serial No.: 09/871,031

Docket No.: KCC-15,208

New Claim	Corresponding Canceled Claim
39	11
40	12
41	13
42	14
43	15
44	21
45	22
46	23
47	24
48	25
49	26
50	27
51	28
52	29

Applicants believe that the claims, as now presented, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that any issues remain unresolved, then please telephone the undersigned at (874) 490-1400.

Respectfully submitted,



Maxwell J. Petersen
Reg. No. 32,772

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195
TEL (847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403